

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/977,154	10/12/2001	Hugh S. West JR.	14000.11	3848
75	90 05/20/2004		EXAM	INER
John M. Guynn			RAMANA, ANURADHA	
WORKMAN, N	VYDEGGER & SEELEY			
1000 Eagle Gate Tower		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
60 East South T	emple emple		3732	
Salt Lake City, UT 84111			DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	,
	09/977,154	WEST, HUGH S.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anu Ramana	3732	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rion. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thir period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON y statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed (y (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on	19 March 2004.		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ∑	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice up			
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18,20,21 and 23-32</u> is/are per 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wis 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18 and 20-21 and 23-32</u> is/are 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	ithdrawn from consideration. e rejected.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International E * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in A e priority documents have beer Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO-Paper No(s)/Mail Date	·*/ — —	s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Art Unit: 3732

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 19, 2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-18, 20-21, 23-24, 28-29, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (US 2,382,019 or '019) in view of Rieser et al. (US 6,387,129 or '129).

'019 discloses a threaded body extending between a proximal end 1 and a distal end 7 with a proximal section 2 having a proximal thread 3 and a distal threaded section 4 having a screw thread 5 of the same number of convolutions per inch (or pitch) as the proximal section 2 and a tapered transition section (Fig. 1 and lines 27-49).

- '019 also discloses that proximal end 1 can be any desired form or entirely omitted.
- '019 does not disclose that proximal end 1 can be angled.
- '129 teaches providing an angled back or "end" to a screw so that it can be oriented substantially flush with the outer surface of the bone in which it is placed (Fig. 3 and 4, col. 2, lines 41-47 and col. 4, lines 4-5).

Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the '019 screw with an angled proximal end, as taught by '129, so that the '019 screw would be flush with the outer surface of the bone in which it is

Art Unit: 3732

placed. Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the proximal end of the '019 screw with an angle within a range of 10 to 80 degrees or 20 to 60 degrees or 30 to 40 degrees, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

'129 also teaches sizing screw 20 for placement in a bone tunnel (col. 4, lines 62-65).

Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have made the '019 screw of an appropriate length and size, as taught by '129, for placement in a bone tunnel.

Further, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have changed the size (length or diameter) of the screw of the combination of '019 and '129 to match the size of a bone tunnel into which it is placed, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Regarding claim 2, '129 teaches providing a hexagonal socket 28 in screw 20 for receiving the hexagonal tip 80 of a driver 70 (Figs. 1 and 8, col. 4, lines 13-18 and col. 5, lines 23-31).

Regarding claim 13, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have made the screw of the combination of '019 and '129 of a material such as titanium, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use, herein placement within a human body, as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Regarding claim 16, interference screws have a length in a range of about 8 mm to 70 mm (see cited US 6,045,554, col. 3, lines 48-54). It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have changed the size of the screw of combination of '019 and '129, depending on the particular use, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Art Unit: 3732

Regarding claim 23, '019 shows proximal threaded section 2 as having a length. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have made the length of the proximal threaded section 5 mm, depending on the bone in which the screw of the combination of '019 and '129 is placed, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Luks et al. (US 6,368,322 or '322) in view of Wagner et al. (US 6,565,566 or '566).

'322 discloses an interference screw 10 having a length of 10-35 mm wherein screw 10 has portions of varying diameter. '322 also discloses using screw 10 for wedging soft tissue inside a bone tunnel, for example during an ACL procedure (Figs. 1, 5-6 and 9, col. 3, lines 58-65, col. 4, lines 28-32 and lines 59-67 and col. 5, lines 1-9).

'322 does not disclose that the portions of varying diameter have constant thread depth.

'566 teaches a screw 22 having portions of variable diameter wherein the variable diameter portions can have variable thread depth or constant thread depth depending on the purchase required in soft bone tissue (Fig. 2a and col. 4, lines 22-33).

Accordingly it would have been a matter of obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided a constant thread depth to screw 10 of '322, as taught by '566, depending on the purchase required in soft bone tissue.

The method steps of claim 25 are rendered obvious by the above discussion.

Claims 26-27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (US 2,382,019 or '019) in view of Rieser et al. (US 6,387,129 or '129) and Wagner et al. (US 6,565,566 or '566).

'019 and '129 are silent about thread depth.

'566 teaches a screw 22 having a variable thread depth or a constant thread depth depending on the purchase required in soft bone tissue (Fig. 2a and col. 4, lines 22-33).

Art Unit: 3732

Page 5

Accordingly it would have been a matter of obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided a constant thread depth to the screw of the combination of '019 and '129, as taught by '566, depending on the purchase required in soft bone tissue.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anu Ramana whose telephone number is (703) 306-4035. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached (703) 308-2582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AR Anuscos lamare May 16, 2004

> EDUARDO C. ROBERT PRIMARY EXAMINER